

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSAL TO SUPPRESS *HYLA CRUCIALIS* HARLAN, 1826 (AMPHIBIA) Z.N.(S.) 1982

By Michael J. Tyler

(South Australian Museum, Adelaide, South Australia, Australia)

The action of Trueb (1972) requesting the Commission to exercise its plenary powers to suppress the name *crucialis*, as used in the combination *Hyla crucialis* Harlan, 1826, in favour of conservation of the junior synonym *Hyla lichenata* (Gosse, 1851) is based on two criteria: demonstration that *Hyla crucialis* was a genuine *nomen oblitum*, and that *lichenata* had been used extensively and exclusively in subsequent literature.

Crombie (1973) has criticised the proposal on a number of grounds, and has recommended strict application of the Law of Priority. He has further drawn attention to the fact that Tyler (1971) "used *lichenata* although I had informed him of the existence of the Harlan name before publication."

Trueb's application and Crombie's comments have now to be considered in the context of the amendments to Articles 79 and 80 (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, Vol. 29, pt. 4, Dec. 1972).

Crombie has attempted to invalidate the basis of Trueb's case by demonstrating that several of the literature references to *lichenata* cited by her, do not constitute "usage" in the sense now defined in Article 79 (b) i. Hence much of his own case relies upon assessing the merits of some of them, to influence interpretation under Article 79 (b) ii. Nevertheless, in discussing the inadequate state of knowledge of the species, and the limited number of references to it, he mentions 5 papers not cited by Trueb in her application. Three of them (Dunn, 1929; Panton, 1929; Lynn and Dent, 1943), do contribute new data. It should be noted that Trueb cited papers only as an example of usage, not to provide an exhaustive and complete list as may now be necessary.

Additional references to the use of the name *lichenata* appear in Barbour (1910), Noble (1927, 1929, 1931). Of these, Noble (1929) reports larval gut contents. The other papers by Noble draw heavily upon data published by Dunn (1926), but the 1931 reference is highly relevant to the present assessment. In illustrating the species, and discussing its possible phylogenetic relationships to other West Indian hylid frogs under the topic of parallel evolution, Noble did more than anyone else to publicise the name. It will not be disputed by herpetologists that the 1931 text (reprinted by Dover in 1954) was the standard worldwide reference work on the Amphibia for several decades. Hence it is surprising that Crombie contends: "the name is unfamiliar to many herpetologists, even some working in the West Indies."

In October 1970 Mr. Crombie advised me of his discovery of the description of *Hyla crucialis*, and of his certainty that it was a senior synonym of *lichenata*. In the same month I urged him to undertake his responsibility as discoverer of the name to refer it to the Commission. Dr. Trueb has taken that initiative, and I record my complete support of her proposal.

REFERENCES

- BARBOUR, T. 1910. Notes on the herpetology of Jamaica. *Bull. Mus. Comp. Zool.* 52 (15) : 273-301
- CROMBIE, R. I. 1973. Comment on the proposed suppression of *Hyla crucialis* (Amphibia). Z.N.(S.) 1982. *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, 30, (1) : 4-6
- DUNN, E. R. 1926. The frogs of Jamaica. *Proc. Boston Soc. Nat. Hist.* 38, (4) : 111-130
- DUNN, E. R. 1929. On the trail of the snorer. *Nature*, 13 (2) : 110-112
- GOSSÉ, P. H. 1851. *A naturalist's sojourn in Jamaica*. London, 508 pp.
- HARLAN, R. 1826. A new species of *Hyla*. *Amer. J. Sci. Arts.* 10 (7)
- LYNN, W. G., and DENT, J. N. 1943. Notes on Jamaican amphibians. *Copeia* 1943 (4) : 234-242

- NOBLE, G. K. 1927. The value of life history data in the study of the evolution of the Amphibia. *Ann. New York Acad. Sci.* 30 : 31-128
- NOBLE, G. K. 1929. The adaptive modifications of the arboreal tadpoles of Hophophryne and the torrent tadpoles of Staurois. *Bull. Amer. Mus. Nat. Hist.* 58 (7) : 291-334
- NOBLE, G. K. 1931. *The Biology of the Amphibia*. McGraw-Hill
- PANTON, E. S. 1952. Our ground and tree-frogs—glimpses into their life and habits. *Nat. Hist. Notes, Nat. Hist. Soc. Jamaica*, 5 (53) : 87-92
- TRUEB, L. 1972. *Hyla crucialis* Harlan, 1826 (Amphibia): proposed suppression under plenary powers. *Z.N.(S.)* 1982. *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 21 (1) : 39-40
- TYLER, M. J. 1971. The phylogenetic significance of vocal sac structure in hylid frogs. *Univ. Kansas Publ., Mus. Nat. Hist.* 19 : 319-360

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED DESIGNATION OF A NEOTYPE OF
LUMBRICUS TERRESTRIS LINNAEUS, 1758. *Z.N.(S.)* 272

(See vol. 30; 27-31)

By Per Brinck (Department of Animal Ecology, University of Lund, Sweden)

When Bouché (1972) dropped (*Lumbricus*) *terrestris* Linnaeus and replaced it with *L. herculeus* Savigny, I found it regrettable as being contrary to the provisions of the Code. On the other hand, this use of the names is a local French tradition since the misidentifications (1822, 1826) by Savigny of the species. Therefore I did not regard it seriously. I agree, however, that it is wise to avoid future confusion by designation of a neotype, so I support the application by Dr. Sims.

May I add a few details. Linnaeus's first reference (1758: 647) is "*Fn. svec. 1271*" which refers to his first edition of *Fauna svecica* (Holmiae, 1746). There he lists *L. terrestris* as a Swedish species (as he had already in *Animalia per Seuciam observata*, Upsaliae, 1736; probably printed in 1742), mentioned the vernacular names in Swedish (metmask, daggmask) and wrote "... Coelint hi vermes supra terram approximatis collaribus, hinc exeundo e terra ad copulam tumulos effodiunt, hortis et ambulacris molesti ..." which is a good characterization of *L. terrestris* auctorum. Linnaeus commented on his *Fauna svecica* in a series of lectures, 1749-52 (edited by E. Lönnberg, Stockholm, 1913: Linnés föreläsningar öfver djurriket). It contains a long and detailed description of traits of the life history of *Lumbricus terrestris* (pp. 291-2), containing behavioural observations which, to my knowledge, do not exist in the modern literature. It is true that a passage deals with species which are remote from *L. terrestris* which was at least at that early time a composite species. Linnaeus commented on these worms "... they look very different, but are I suppose the same species" (transl.).

COMMENTS ON THE CASE OF *AGLAJA* RENIER (MOLLUSCA) *Z.N.(S.)* 1092
(See volume 29, pages 127-130)

By Curtis W. Sabrosky (Systematic Entomology Laboratory, Agricultural Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.)

I do not oppose the main purpose of the application by Lemche for the conservation of *Aglaja* Renier and the two originally included species. However, I would comment on several associated matters.

2. (Paragraph 6) Lemche cites Bergh, 1894, as author and date of Aglajidae, as 'prescribed' by Article 40. On the contrary, Article 40b states only that the junior family-group name takes the date of the rejected senior family-group name, not its author, and this is borne out by the wording of Recommendation 40a. Under this recommendation, the citation should be Aglajidae Pilsbry, 1895 (1894). The correct name of the author is Pilsbry, not Pilsbury or Pilsby as variously stated. Furthermore,